

**A narrative of the proceedings relative to the appointment of the medical officers to the Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport Hospital / by W.C. Engledue.**

**Contributors**

Engledue, W. C. 1814-1859.  
Royal College of Surgeons of England

**Publication/Creation**

Portsea (Hampshire) : Printed by W. Woodward, [1849]

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/rgckvg3u>

**Provider**

Royal College of Surgeons

**License and attribution**

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>





# A NARRATIVE

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS RELATIVE TO THE APPOINTMENT OF

THE MEDICAL OFFICERS

TO THE

**Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport Hospital.**

BY W. C. ENGLDUE, M.D.,

*Formerly President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh.*

---

"If an offence come out of the Truth, better is it that the offence come, than the Truth be concealed."—JEROME.

---

SECOND EDITION.

PORTSEA :

PRINTED BY W. WOODWARD.

[Price One Shilling.]



# LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

---

**Narrative of Proceedings, &c.**

---

---

---

Division of Geography, etc.

---



## PREFACE.

~~~~~

I have carefully perused the following pages, and I have made two verbal alterations ; but as regards the facts and statements, I have nothing to add—nothing to retract. Whilst writing this narrative I entertained some fears that my strictures would be thought too severe, but I am pleased to find such is not the case.\* If there be individuals who consider them so, in justification, they are referred to the occasion which called them forth, and to the opinion of Lord Bacon, who says, “Men cannot contend coldly, and without affection, about things which they hold dear and precious.” Previous to the appearance of the first edition, there were all kinds of exaggerated statements abroad, chiefly circulated by the party who had committed the injustice ; but now all is quiet, and with the exception of a paragraph which appeared in the *Hampshire Telegraph*, to be presently referred to, I have not heard the slightest adverse whisper, not even an insinuation against the truth of the facts recorded, or the justice of the reflections indulged in.

“Soft and easy touch a nettle,  
And it stings you for your pains ;  
Grasp it like a man of mettle,  
And it soft as silk remains.”

Till the documents contained in this pamphlet were published, the large majority of individuals were not at all aware of the real merits of the question. The position taken up by the medical gentlemen had been first so shamefully misrepresented, and then, these misrepresenta-

---

\* I am informed on the best authority that the great Sir F. Thesiger has been consulted respecting an action upon the contents of “the narrative.” *Parturiunt montes nascetur ridiculus mus.*



tions so industriously circulated by individuals who knew better, but who apparently considered that the end justifies the means, that the judgment of those whose duty it was to come to a just conclusion, was most effectually hood-winked. This was the difficulty we had to contend with. But difficulties which are *to be* removed, will always crumble before resolute and reiterated assaults. Accordingly, I imagined that if I removed the fig-leaf with which truth had been disfigured, and dispelled the mist which had for three months obscured the intellectual horizon of those who had bestowed a thought on the subject, I should at any rate, perform a duty, and most probably assist in obtaining that meed of justice for my professional brethren, which the selfish and domineering spirit of a few had withheld. I thought that I might with safety appeal to that innate love of candour, fair play, and honest intentions, which, notwithstanding the occasional defalcation of a few therefrom, is still, happily, one of the distinguishing characteristics of Englishmen. I thought that the majority of my fellow-townsmen would answer, yea, to the eloquent sentiment of Dr. Channing—"The love of truth, a deep thirst for it, a deliberate purpose to seek and hold it fast, may be considered as the very foundation of human culture and dignity." I thought, on the part of my professional brethren, that those with whom we were enjoying daily intercourse, would feel anxious to obtain a plain statement of facts, and I have not been disappointed. I hear from all quarters that but one opinion has been expressed—in the first place, regret that good faith was not kept by adhering to the plain intention of the original resolution; and in the second place, a strong desire to remedy the mischief, by adopting the plan suggested by the medical profession.

I repeat, we ask no favour. We only demand justice. We fall back on the original documents; on the faith and sacred integrity of which documents THE MONEY WAS COLLECTED. On all occasions, and in every discussion, we shall cry out, "What saith the bond?" The acts of the Hospital Committee must be viewed with rigid impartiality. There must be no attempt to be lenient in this matter—no effort to place the best construction, as it is called, on a course of procedure which cannot be morally defended. "An inclination to favour, in any degree, however small, one side in any question, is evidently not an inclination to do *strict and impartial* justice upon it, but the contrary.



PREFACE.

And a disposition to put a favorable construction on facts and documents, is a disposition to put an *erroneous* construction upon them.\*"

The following paragraph appeared in the *Hampshire Telegraph* on Saturday, March 17th :—

"Dr. Engledue has, by an unnecessary five sheet pamphlet, most fully proved the old adage 'that two Kings cannot live in Brentford.' We are deeply indebted to the Doctor for his early good will, and still kinder advice on the origination of the scheme of an Hospital in the Island of Portsea ; but he really mars all his good intentions and talented exertions, by the publication of 60 pages of bitter vituperation, *mis-stated assertions*, not a little *mystification*, a great deal of twaddle and quarreling about straws, and a sad display of spleen against former friends. In fact, every feature in the whole pamphlet is condemnable except one, and that one is the very just and merited chastisement which Dr. E. inflicts on the Clergy of the neighbourhood, for their invasion of the Charity Box of the concern, by the appointment of a Chaplain to an Hospital, at that moment, without a patient, and in a building where at the farthest there could be but twelve patients. We regret, for Dr. Engledue's reputation, the issue of this pamphlet."

On perceiving this, I immediately sent the following note to Mr. Harrison :—

MARCH 18th, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR,

I perceive you have thought it right to make some reflections on the "Narrative" which I have just published. As I may possibly have to publish a second edition, will you have the goodness to inform me which are the "mis-stated assertions," and which page contains the "not a little mystification."

I am very anxious to be correct, and shall esteem it a great favor on the part of any individual, to point out to me any mistake I may have committed, or any passage which may not be considered clear.

I remain,

My Dear Sir,

Your's truly,

W. C. ENGLEDUE.

I have not received an answer to this note, nor has any notice been taken of it in the columns of the paper published a week after the receipt of it. I shall not trust myself to make comments on this conduct. It is an old trick of some nameless attorney, when defending a bad

---

\* An introduction to the study of *Moral Evidence*, by the Rev. James E. Gambier, 3rd edition, page 74.



## PREFACE.

cause, to instruct his counsel thus—"No defence ; abuse the plaintiff's attorney !" So, to abuse me is to refute my pamphlet. Be it so. There is but one sentence which I shall notice, and that because it contains an insinuation which is industriously circulated in private life, viz., that I have indulged in "a sad display of spleen against former friends." It is impossible for local residents to mistake this allusion to a subject which any one of the least delicacy of feeling would have deemed inappropriate for newspaper interference. If *former* friends are not *present* friends, it is not my fault. The change is *theirs*, not *mine*. The cause of the estrangement is deeper than may at first sight appear. I should be as ready to justify my conduct on that question, *if the proper necessity arose*, as I am now on this question, which is a rightful subject of public appeal. Meanwhile, one may pity the cause which needs to be supported by such unworthy means.

But in one sense, even abuse is gratifying. It seems clear that, making due allowance for difference of opinion, my appeal to facts and documents was felt to press so hard, that *some* answer was needful. I am at liberty to infer that no *better* answer could be given, and I am therefore willing to bear the abuse for the sake of the admission.

W. C. E.

SOUTHSEA,  
March 30th, 1849.

A

## NARRATIVE OF PROCEEDINGS,

*&c., &c.*

---

IF an excuse be considered necessary for the publication of the following pages, I can have no difficulty in presenting a satisfactory one; it is to be found in the necessity which exists for publicly answering the question which has been put to me daily for the last month—"Why are you not one of the medical officers of the Portsmouth Hospital?" This question admits of a very simple answer. I never will connect myself with any Institution having for its leading feature the fulfilment of the great precept of charity, but which is so governed as to clearly prove that the precept which is placed on its front, is to receive a partial and unjust interpretation. But to make myself clearly understood, it will be necessary to present a brief outline of the transactions which have taken place during the last few years. I am anxious to do this, because I have



taken a prominent part in all the preliminary arrangements for the erection of the Hospital, and having personally canvassed and solicited money from a large number of the subscribers, I feel that this course is due to my own sense of consistency, and in accordance with my views of what is just and honorable.

From the day I commenced my professional career in these towns, I became convinced of the necessity for the establishment of a Hospital. About nine years ago I communicated my views to several friends, and they agreed to assist me. In a short time I found, that by merely discussing the matter, and asking for assistance, I could, by these private efforts alone, reckon on the nucleus of a building fund of between three and four hundred pounds. This amount was only promised. It was then suggested, as the proposed Institution, if erected, was not to supersede, but rather to increase the benefits of the Dispensary, that the Managing Committee of the Dispensary should be invited to assist in carrying out the contemplated object. This was done. The Committee passed a resolution acceding to this wish, and a day was appointed for a conference. The result of this conference was, that the Committee of the Dispensary passed resolutions, by which they pledged themselves to assist our efforts; but at the same time there was such a manifestation of apathy and distrust on the part of some, and such great jealousy and bad feeling displayed on the part of others, that it became pretty evident, if the plan were proceeded with, in the place of a cordial co-operation, there would soon be organized an active opposi-



tion. I do not consider it necessary to enter into details ; I merely wish to record the fact that an attempt was made some years ago to found a Hospital, and that the attempt failed, mainly from the occurrence of circumstances over which my friends had no control. It was agreed on the part of those who recommended the conference, that the question should rest for a time.

The necessity for the existence of such an Institution became daily more and more apparent, and the subject never ceased to occupy my thoughts, as is well known to all those of my fellow-townsmen with whom I have been professionally connected. In the winter of 1845, I met Mr. T. E. Owen casually in the street, who said, " I recollect some years ago that I assisted you in your endeavours to found a Hospital ; I wish you would speak to your friends again, and originate another movement ; if you will, I will place my name on your list for a hundred pounds." I did as Mr. Owen suggested, and the ten gentlemen who met at a private residence for the purpose of discussing the matter, were called upon individually, and requested to do so by me. I recollect at this first meeting clearly expressing my views about the necessity of throwing open the medical appointments to all legally qualified medical men. In the course of a month we had held three meetings at this private residence, and had arranged our plans and taken all the necessary steps for calling a public meeting of the inhabitants, when to our astonishment there appeared in the *Hampshire Telegraph* an advertisement calling a meeting of the



subscribers to the Public Dispensary, for the purpose of discussing the propriety of erecting a Hospital. It was evident to all, that the party through whose instrumentality the former movement had been arrested, had heard of our proceedings, and influenced by those petty feelings, which all honorable men endeavour to keep in abeyance, instead of coming forward to assist us, was determined to get up a counter movement, and thus to destroy, or at any rate to weaken, our efforts. I feel pleasure in recording the fact, that my friends at our next assemblage, although conscious that they had been checkmated so far as their contemplated meeting was concerned, were unanimous in expressing their opinion, that we should immediately give up our intended meeting, and again offer our services to the Dispensary Committee. We all felt that we had to meet a display of vulgar selfishness and low cunning, and that the best way of doing this was, to shew that we were animated with the opposite feelings, thus doing our duty as regards the great object we had in view, and at the same time exhibiting a rebuke to the offending party.

We accordingly acted in this way. A meeting of the subscribers to the Dispensary and *others* friendly to the object, was held at the Dispensary, and it was expressly understood and publicly stated, that since we, the originators of the movement, had given up our contemplated meeting, the proposed Institution, if erected, should be considered as emanating from the inhabitants of the Borough, and not from the Subscribers to the Dispensary. After a great deal of dis-



cussion, and considerable opposition on the part of some of the Dispensary Committee, the point was conceded. It was also expressly stated, that the medical appointments to the Hospital were to be on a different plan altogether to that pursued in the Dispensary; and the chairman of our section Mr. W. Grant, stated if the doctrine of "free trade,"\* as regards the medical attendance was not conceded, we would withdraw at once, because we considered this a fundamental point, and one essential to the efficient working of the proposed Institution. The chairman's language was, "These are our terms; we consider this medical question so necessary to be clearly understood, that we will not join you unless you fully comprehend and guarantee this position." The point was conceded, insomuch as it was perfectly understood that these were the only terms on which we joined the meeting, and resolutions were passed in accordance with these views. At this meeting I stated the same opinions, and there are

---

\* This was his own term, and will serve to shew the extent to which he was prepared to go. He was publicly pledged at this meeting, and he was privately pledged to me before the meeting to pursue this policy; and yet he declared to the deputation of medical men, on a subsequent occasion, as will be hereafter seen, that he would resign the chair if the Hospital Committee agreed to the wishes of the Profession, these wishes being precisely those for which he originally contended. *O tempora! O mores!* Many gentlemen who were present at the meeting to which I refer, remember the strong language which he used on this portion of the question, and have expressed their great astonishment to me, at this, to use a mild term, dereliction from good faith. At the last meeting of Subscribers, when he was told of his former opinions and statements, he repeated the same language, and to shew how little real meaning he attaches to his own words, he stated that he still adhered to the doctrine of "free trade," although at this very meeting all his exertions were used on the Protectionist side of the question, that is to say, in supporting the presumed privileges of the Committee of Management to elect the Medical Officers. It is evident that these public asseverations are to be taken in the *non-natural sense*.



many who remember the remarks I made on that occasion. At this *preliminary* meeting therefore, the gentlemen assembled, and my professional brethren, fully understood my wishes on the subject, and after the meeting I was thanked by several of them, for the just and liberal footing on which this important question had been placed.

On the 18th of March, 1846, a Public Meeting of the Inhabitants was held at the Beneficial Society's Hall, the Mayor, J. Hoskins, Esq. in the Chair. The Resolutions submitted to this meeting were the joint productions of Mr. W. Grant and myself. *The points embraced by these resolutions and all the previous arrangements were the result of our combined deliberations.*

*“ At a Public Meeting of the Inhabitants of Portsmouth, Portsea, Gosport, and their Neighbourhoods, held on the 18th of March, 1846, at the Beneficial Society's Hall, to take into consideration the propriety of endeavouring to establish a Hospital, the Mayor, JAMES HOSKINS, ESQ., in the Chair, the following Resolutions were unanimously passed :”—*

1st.—“ That it is desirable that a Hospital for the Sick and Hurt should be established for these Towns and Neighbourhood, to be called ‘ The Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport Hospital.’ ”

2nd.—“ That the resident Clergy and Ministers, the resident Medical Practitioners, and such Gentlemen as shall be named at this Meeting, be invited to act as a Committee of Management, to raise the



necessary funds by way of Donations and Annual Subscriptions, and to carry out the object contemplated in the first resolution,—Five to be a quorum, and that they have power to add to their numbers.”

3rd.—“ That the resident Medical Practitioners be invited to render their professional services to the Hospital, under Regulations to be hereafter adopted.”

These resolutions, let it be remembered, were all passed *unanimously*. The reason that the second and third resolutions were passed, was, the great anxiety which Mr. Grant and I felt that there should be no misunderstanding at any future period. We therefore placed all the resident practitioners on the Committee of Management, and invited all to render their services when the Institution should be erected; and the fact of these resolutions being submitted to the meeting, and passed *unanimously*, clearly proves that the framers of the resolutions, and the gentlemen composing the meeting, meant the same thing. There is no ambiguity in the language. Is it possible for one moment to conceive, that the Professional Men in a body were placed on the Committee of Management, and invited to collect funds for the endowment of an Institution *from which they were to be excluded*? Is it not quite evident that for the purpose of giving force to the *second* Resolution it was absolutely necessary to pass the *third*?

These preliminaries then being settled, I came to the conclusion to which all rational and conscientious



men must feel I was justified—that the inhabitants of a town, in public meeting assembled, with their chief magistrate in the chair, having formally and unanimously passed a series of Resolutions as the basis on which they were to proceed to carry out a great philanthropic object *by the collection of money*, were irrevocably bound by these resolutions, and that it was not in their power, or, if in their power, it certainly could not be considered an honest action, *for the same party*, after having collected the money, to abrogate them. I came to the conclusion, and I think here also I was justified, that however private individuals, in their private affairs, may consider it expedient for the advancement of their own selfish interests to adopt a crooked policy, that on a public question, there would at least be the manifestation of some little conscientiousness, and that when they were prompted to alter their course from whatever cause, they would have listened to the whisperings of the great internal monitor—“What saith the bond?”

Immediately after the meeting, the subscription list was opened, and feeling convinced that two of the objects for which I had so long contended were now definitively settled—I mean the speedy erection of a Hospital, and the basis on which the medical and surgical attendance was to be conducted; I placed my name on that list for a donation, and an annual subscription. The fact of my doing this clearly shews that I then had no misgivings as to the course to be pursued. If I had entertained the least idea that any change could have been effected by which my profes-



sional brethren and myself, unless we were disposed to sacrifice a principle for which we had contended, would be excluded, I certainly should have refrained from assisting with my mite to promote a scheme to be conducted on such selfish and unjust principles. The first intimation I received, which convinced me that the spirit and manifest intention of the *third* resolution would not be carried out without an opposition, was at a committee meeting, a few days after the large meeting at the Beneficial Society's Hall. I do not think it necessary to repeat here the language uttered; it is sufficient to remark that an incidental conversation elicited opinions from two gentlemen, which convinced me that although they had not opposed the resolutions at the public meeting, they fully intended to prevent, if possible, the same being carried out. In fact, they fell back on their original grounds of opposition, although resolutions had been passed for the express purpose of preventing the question being raised again, and they had assisted in passing them, for they were present and they were passed *unanimously*. The chairman of the committee, Mr. W. Grant, interfered, and said, the point raised was settled at the public meeting by the *third* resolution. I took the opportunity of expressing my feelings strongly on the subject, and immediately made up my mind as to the course to be pursued. I reported the conversation to my medical brethren, and pointed out to them the possibility of good faith not being kept with them. Recent proceedings have demonstrated that my conclusions were correct.



When the erection of the Hospital was so far advanced as to render it probable that it would be open for the reception of patients within a year, I thought the opportunity had arrived for consulting my medical brethren as to the course we should pursue. This then was the position of the question. We had all been invited by a formal resolution passed at a public meeting of the inhabitants, "to render our professional services" to the Hospital, but in Committee a spirit had been displayed, which caused me to entertain some doubts as to the interpretation which this resolution was to receive. In this apparent state of doubt, who were to discuss the matter—the medical men, the party immediately interested in the question, who had been invited to render their services, and with whom good faith ought to be kept—or the Committee, the party indirectly interested, and certain members of which had shewn a disposition to break good faith? Again, the whole body of professional men having been invited to "render their professional services," who were to originate the plan by which these services were to be made available, the party conferring the favour, and whose services were to be rendered gratuitously, or the party demanding the favor, and who were not in a position to offer remuneration?\*

---

\* I beg to be distinctly understood. As a body of professional men we ask for no remuneration. We are always ready to render our assistance to the distressed. Our reward consists in the gratification we feel in the performance of an action which we are proud to consider one of the duties of our calling. It is not so with the other professions. The clerical and legal gentlemen present at the meeting at which this question was decided, voted against the proposal of their medical brethren. The former, as we shall presently see, considered it in accordance with their notions of



favor, and at the same time dictate the terms in which that favor is to be conferred? Does it not seem reasonable, when a body of gentlemen are invited to *gratuitously* perform a work involving the expenditure of a great deal of time and labour, that they should be permitted to state the course they would wish to pursue, so that the work may be performed in the way most agreeable to themselves? Is there anything offensive in such a proceeding? On the contrary, is it not the assertion of a right, and a right which no body of gentlemen out of the profession, has any authority to call in question? Can there be any proceeding more in accordance with the first principles of justice?

Feeling convinced then, that in this purely medical part of the question the medical men ought to be consulted, I wrote the following note to all those with whom I had conversed on the subject, or who I thought likely to interest themselves in the working of the Hospital :—

SOUTHSEA,

*Monday, April 9th, 1848.*

MY DEAR SIR,

Two years ago, when I called the first meeting to take into consideration the possibility of erecting a Hospital, I expressly stated to the gentlemen assembled, that I would not enter upon the subject at all, except it was distinctly understood that the attendance on the inmates should be thrown open to the whole of the legally qualified medi-

---

justice to do this, and at the same time *to vote for their own payment* at the rate of about 3s. 2½d. per visit !! The only legal gentleman who advocated the justice of yielding to the wishes of the medical profession was Mr. Binstead. He appealed, but he appealed in vain, to his brethren to place themselves in a similar position to that which the medical gentlemen occupied, and to say whether they would not feel inclined to make a similar demand.



cal practitioners in the island ; that is to say, in other words, that the members of our profession should arrange amongst themselves the plan which should be pursued as regards the medical and surgical management. At committee meetings, on one or two occasions since this period, I have stated the same, and I still hold to this opinion. There is every prospect that the Hospital will be opened during the ensuing summer, and I think the time is come when the members of our profession should meet, and consider the course which they will adopt for the purpose of averting any attempt at monopoly, and endeavouring to place the medical and surgical arrangements on the most liberal footing. I feel sure that this can be accomplished, but there must be a manifestation of unanimity on our part ; and in my opinion, the sooner this takes place the better. If you agree in this, will you attend a meeting at my house on Thursday evening next, at eight o'clock ? I shall feel obliged by an answer.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

W. C. ENGLEDEUE.

---

This note met with general approbation, and *eighteen* gentlemen attended the meeting. Several notes from other gentlemen regretting their inability to attend the meeting, stated that the writers fully agreed with the object in view, and that they would support any measure which received the approbation of the Profession. The only answer I received of a contrary character was from Dr. Scott, who declined attending a meeting of his professional brethren, because he considered that they had no authority to meet together to discuss the question ! At this meeting it was considered right to bring the question involved to the test ; and thus, previous to entering into any arrangement or plan, to endeavour to ascertain the intentions of the Hospital Committee. The following



resolutions were passed and signed by all the gentlemen present, and presented by me to the Hospital Committee, on the 23rd of July, 1848.

*“At a meeting of the undermentioned gentlemen, on the 12th day of April, 1848, the following resolutions were unanimously passed :”—*

*Moved by Mr. Garrington,*

*Seconded by Mr. White,*

“That it is the opinion of this meeting that the medical appointments to the new Hospital should be open to all the qualified practitioners within the district who are willing to devote their attention to the performance of the duties.”

*Moved by Mr. E. A. Smith,*

*Seconded by Mr. Carter,*

“That Dr. Engledue be requested to communicate the above resolution to the Committee of Management of the Hospital, and urge the same as the expression of the strong feeling of the gentlemen composing the meeting.”

*Signed,*

MOSES PIERCEY,

E. A. SMITH,

G. J. SCALES,

R. G. F. SMITH,

G. J. SCALE, JUN.

S. BENTHAM,

K. E. KNIGHT,

E. P. PERKS,

J. GREETHAM,

W. H. GARRINGTON,

E. RAPER,

T. ROLPH,

H. BLOXHAM,

G. N. EDISS,

R. WHITE,

H. CARTER,

G. B. HELLARD,

W. C. ENGLUEDUE.



The battery was immediately unmasked. The gentlemen who on a former occasion hinted that the resolution was not to be carried out, now expressed their astonishment that the medical men should think of meeting together to discuss the question. All the members of the Hospital committee present at this meeting, declared that they would not attend to the resolutions submitted by the medical men, because the meeting from which they emanated took place at a private residence:—they even refused to record the fact that the resolutions had been submitted to them, although I proposed that they should be inserted in the minutes of the meeting; and they terminated their proceedings by issuing the following circular addressed to every medical man in the district. It will be observed, that the note from the secretary *does not even acknowledge the receipt* of the resolutions. Was this not treating them with contempt? The secretary merely carried out the views of the committee.

PORTSMOUTH, *July 27th*, 1848.

PORTSMOUTH, PORTSEA, AND GOSPORT HOSPITAL.

SIR,—I am desired by the Committee of this Institution to forward you a copy of a resolution which was passed at their Meeting on the Evening of Tuesday last, and to request the favor of as early a reply as may be consistent with your convenience.

I am, Sir,

Your's, very obediently,

HENRY DEACON, *Hon. Sec.*

*Copy of Resolution referred to in the foregoing.*

*Resolved*—“That a circular be sent to the Medical Practitioners in Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport, being graduates of a British University, or Members of a British College of Surgeons, to ascertain if they would be willing to render their gratuitous services to this Institution.”



As a member of the Hospital committee I voted for the issue of this circular, but at the same time I explained to the committee, that it would be productive of no good, because, although it was addressed to every member of the profession, it did not clearly recognize the principle for which my brethren were contending. The secretary, Mr. H. Deacon, took the same view, and told the committee that their circular left the question involved just in the same state, and that he was quite sure Dr. Engledue would call his medical friends together previous to an answer being returned thereto. At a second meeting of the medical profession, it was decided that the circular should not be answered till the intentions of the Hospital committee, regarding the medical appointments, were clearly understood.—The following resolution was passed.

SIR,

31st July, 1848,

We, the undersigned, beg to forward the following resolution, passed unanimously at a meeting of the medical profession, held on the 28th instant, as a reply to the circular from you:—

“That this meeting having been informed that a resolution passed at a meeting of the members of the medical profession, held on the 12th day of April last, has not been received by the sub-committee, pledge themselves to take no appointment in the new Hospital unless the principle enunciated in that resolution be recognized.”

E. A. SMITH,

W. C. ENGLEDUE,

H. BLOXHAM,

G. B. HELLARD,

G. N. EDISS,

G. J. SCALE,

J. W. OWEN,

S. BENTHAM,

H. CARTER,

M. PIERCEY,

G. J. SCALE, JUN.

T. IVIMEY,

R. G. F. SMITH,

A. BLUNDELL,

T. ROLPH,

K. E. KNIGHT,

T. G. IVIMEY,

H. SLIGHT,

W. H. GARRINGTON,

R. WHITE,

G. D. MEADOWS,

E. P. PERKS,

J. SLIGHT,

J. GREETHAM.

To H. DEACON, Esq., Secretary.



At the next Hospital Committee this resolution was taken into consideration, and after a great deal of discussion, which only convinced me more and more, that under the most liberal protestations the most gross injustice was about to be perpetrated, the Secretary read the draft of a letter which he had prepared before attending the Committee Meeting, and which was received with joy by the Committee, and with regret by me. With joy by the former, because it left the question just where it was,—to the medical men a state of doubt,—and with regret by me, because I felt that I was associated with individuals who were not acting in that straightforward way which is usual with persons who intend to strictly perform what they profess. Here is the letter.

PORTSMOUTH,  
August 8th, 1848.

PORTSMOUTH, PORTSEA, AND GOSPORT HOSPITAL.

SIR,

I am desired by the Committee of this Institution to acknowledge the receipt of a resolution signed by you, under date of the 31st of July, 1848, and to explain to you that the Committee always have been of opinion that the appointment of the medical officers required should be open to *the whole medical profession, and they have seen no reason to alter that opinion.* They have always thought, and still think, that there should *be no exclusive selection.* This opinion was freely given by the members of the committee present at the meeting on the 25th of July last, and it was clearly understood by all present that this liberal principle would be acted on. Previously, however, to any formal recognition by the committee of the principle alluded to, they sought information from the medical gentlemen present, as to whether its adoption might not possibly lead to a practical difficulty, looking to the large number of medical practitioners in this district, and the comparatively small number who would be required for the purposes



of the Hospital, and the Committee have to regret that they were unable to obtain any satisfactory information on this point; one of the medical gentlemen, out of the two present, having declined giving any opinion whatever on the subject. Under these circumstances, it was suggested, with the full concurrence of every gentleman present, that measures should be taken for ascertaining how many medical practitioners would kindly lend their gratuitous services to the Hospital, *in order that they might thus be able to form some opinion as to whether the liberal principle they wished to adopt could be reduced within practicable limits.* With this view the resolution was passed, a copy of which I had the honor to send to every member of the medical profession on the 27th ult. Under these circumstances, the committee were certainly of opinion that, as there appeared to be no difference between "*the principle enunciated in your resolution*" and that recognized by them, it would be better the question should not be raised, and they therefore suggested that the resolution should not be entered on the minutes. There was not the least intention, on the part of the committee, of treating the authors of the resolution with disrespect, but they merely wished to avoid raising a question, which they thought could be much better settled quietly and by mutual consent. After this explanation, and having thus recognized the principle enunciated in your resolution, I trust I may again refer you to my circular of the 27th ult., in the hopes that you will oblige me with your reply thereto.

I am, Sir,

Your's, obediently,

HENRY DEACON,

*Honorary Secretary.*

The statement contained in the above letter, that the committee could obtain no information from one of the medical men present with regard to a plan, is not strictly true. This is what took place. The medical men had not submitted a plan because they first wished the principle for which they were contending to be conceded. In the committee I was to a certain extent acting for my professional brethren, and when



I was asked for a plan, I stated that I was not *authorized* to submit a plan, but that if the committee would permit me to speak merely as a member of the committee, and not as the representative of my professional brethren, I would point out to them how perfectly feasible and practicable the arrangements could be made. I then gave a sketch of a plan which I should suggest, but which was immediately and unanimously opposed, because it proposed that the medical men should arrange their names in a certain order, and take turns in the Hospital and Dispensary attendance. The members of the committee declared that they would not submit to this kind of dictation, and that if *twelve* gentlemen sent in their names certifying that they were willing to assist in the duties of the Hospital, that they, the committee, claimed the right of selecting from this number as many as they might require, and that they would not be bound to follow any given order as suggested by me. I pointed out to them that this was an *exclusive selection*. I therefore objected to the publication of this letter, because it did not state the fact. It stated that the committee were opposed to the exclusive selection of the medical men, whereas, I knew that they were determined to choose them from the number who responded to their circular, and thus signified their readiness to assist in the duties of the Hospital. This being the fact\* I think I was justified in designating this letter a jesuitical production—this was the expression I made use of to

---

\* I use the term fact, because I can prove it to be such, as will be seen immediately by a resolution they passed.



the committee on a subsequent occasion, and it is an expression to which I adhere. How could a letter, which stated that there was to be no exclusive selection emanate from this meeting, when the members had just told me that they claimed the right of *selecting* from a given number of names as many as they might require, and which letter even stated that they wished to receive answers “*in order that they might be able to form some opinion as to whether the liberal (!) principle they wished to adopt could be reduced within practicable limits ?*”

Each medical man received a copy of this letter. Of course it was not satisfactory,—How could it be? A meeting of the profession was called, and it was taken into consideration. But one opinion pervaded the meeting regarding this letter. It was denounced as a piece of clap-trap, and as it was evident that nothing clear and definite was to be obtained from the committee through the medium of resolutions or letters, it was determined to appoint a deputation to be entrusted with full powers to enter into the subject. Accordingly, the deputation met the committee, and then a most extraordinary scene occurred. Here was a deputation, with the present mayor, G. Scale, Esq. at its head, granted an interview for the purpose of entering into an explanation of the wishes of the medical profession, and how was it received? The chairman of the Hospital sub-committee, Mr. W. Grant, instead of listening to the explanation of the members of the deputation, as is usual in such cases, commenced the proceedings by delivering a speech, the purport of



which was at first not at all clear, for it was full of contradictions; in fact, it was a weak attempt to make the worse appear the better cause, and necessarily failed because it was delivered to seven gentlemen who came there animated, as they believed, with just notions, and with a definite object in view. He seemed to have an instinctive idea that his observations were not very convincing, for he summed up his address by delivering a few laudatory remarks on the *purity of the motives* which influenced himself and his brother committee men—as if after *the experience* of the last few days the members of the deputation could entertain any doubt upon this point; and by declaring “If the views entertained by the medical profession are adopted by the committee, I will resign the office of chairman.”

Notwithstanding this threat, and the very unusual course pursued by the chairman, Mr. Scale, the chairman of the deputation then submitted the following resolutions passed at the last meeting of the medical profession, and in a few words placed the question at issue in a clear light.

Resolutions passed at a meeting of the members of the medical profession, held on Monday evening, August 14th, 1848, at Paul's Rooms, St. George's Square, Portsea.

*Moved by Mr. Gray,*  
*Seconded by Mr. Lowes,*

“That this meeting fully coincides in the opinion expressed and acted upon at two former meetings



of the profession, held respectively on April 12th and July 31st, 1848, viz.—that it is essential to the well-being of the new Hospital, that the medical appointments thereto should be thrown open to the whole profession, so that every qualified medical man residing in the district may be entitled to attend cases in the Hospital, according to a plan which shall hereafter be arranged and agreed upon between the Committee of the Hospital and the medical profession.”

*Carried unanimously.*

*Moved by Mr. Smith,*

*Seconded by Mr. Carter,*

“That the circular emanating from the Sub-Committee of the Hospital, bearing date August 8th, 1848, is so worded as to cause some doubt whether this principle will be acted upon, in making the medical appointments to the Hospital; or, whether rather the power is not therein reserved to the Committee of Management, to make a selection from those gentlemen who may be willing to tender their gratuitous services to the Charity.”

*Carried unanimously.*

*Moved by Mr. Garrington,*

*Seconded by Mr. Greetham,*

“That the medical practitioners here assembled feeling themselves at perfect liberty (without exposing themselves to the charge of uncharitableness on the one hand, or of a factious opposition to any body of gentlemen on the other), to withhold the



offer of their gratuitous services from any Institution, the conduct of which is based upon principles, to which they are opposed on the grounds of policy, of liberality, and of justice, decline to connect themselves with the Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport Hospital, until the intention of the Committee with reference to the medical appointments are clearly shewn to be in accordance with the principle laid down in the first resolution."

*Carried unanimously.*

*Moved by Mr. Knight,*

*Seconded by Mr. Owen,*

"That a Committee consisting of the Chairman, the Secretary, Mr. Garrington, Mr. Greetham, Mr. Gray, Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Knight be requested to lay these resolutions before the Sub-Committee of the Hospital, and that they forthwith put themselves in communication with the Honorary Secretary of the Hospital for the accomplishment of this purpose."

*Carried unanimously.*

*Moved by Mr. Bentham,*

*Seconded by Mr. G. J. Scale,*

"That the gentlemen named in the foregoing resolution be requested to undertake the entire management of the correspondence with the Committee of the Hospital on the part of the medical practitioners of the district, and that they be entrusted with full powers to make such arrangements in reference to this subject, being in strict accordance



with the foregoing resolutions, as they shall see fit.” *Carried unanimously.*

After some remarks from the other members of the deputation, which elicited the views of the several members of the Committee, the deputation withdrew. And now another curious scene occurred. The chairman having told the deputation at the opening of the proceedings, and before he had any knowledge of what the object of the deputation might be, that their wishes would not be conceded; and having told his Committee, if they granted the request of the medical men, he would resign the chair; immediately after the withdrawal of the deputation, was called to a sense of his real position by the Secretary suggesting the propriety of taking into consideration the answer which was to be sent to the resolutions submitted by the deputation! The official answer having been given by the chairman *in anticipation* of the spirit of the request\*—the request having been heard, of course it was considered expedient to confirm it by a formal resolution, and so after a great loss of time, the following resolutions were adopted, and sent to the secretary of the deputation.

---

\* Just fancy, I beg pardon for the grandeur of the simile, just fancy Lord John Russell receiving a deputation of London merchants, *and before they commenced a detailed statement of their views* on a great commercial question, his Lordship telling them that they may save themselves the trouble of an explanation, for he had quite made up his mind not to grant their wishes, and that rather than do so he would resign the Premiership. Such conduct on the part of so exalted a personage as the Prime Minister of Great Britain would be considered offensive and impertinent, and would not be tolerated for a moment. What can we say then of such conduct in the Chairman of the Sub-Committee of a charitable Institution?



PORTSMOUTH, *August 23rd*, 1848.

PORTSMOUTH, PORTSEA, AND GOSPORT HOSPITAL.

SIR,

In reference to the series of resolutions which were last evening presented to the Sub-committee of the Hospital by a Deputation from a Committee of the Members of the Medical Profession, I have been instructed to forward to you a copy of the two following resolutions, which were passed on the same evening by the said Sub-committee.

I am, Sir,

Your's, very obediently,

HENRY DEACON,

*Honorary Secretary.*

---

*Copy of the two Resolutions referred to above.*

- 1st.—“The sub-committee having considered the series of resolutions now presented by a Deputation from the Committee of the members of the Medical Profession, *are of opinion that the appointment of Medical Officers should rest with the Committee of Management.*”
- 2nd.—“That the Secretary do communicate the above resolution to the Committee of the Medical Profession, with an assurance that the series of resolutions submitted by them shall be laid before the general body of subscribers.”

What a disgraceful state of things! Let us take a retrospect. What have we seen? What did the members of the deputation hear? This resolution was passed by the same persons who issued the letter, and all declaring through the chairman, that they were honorable men, and acting in good faith, *and yet the letter said one thing, and the resolution another!* The secretary at one meeting, writing a letter sanctioned by the chairman and the committee—the chairman in his introductory remarks at the next meeting, un-



checked by the committee, contradicting the letter of the secretary! The secretary declaring to the deputation that he wrote the letter in good faith, which letter said *that there was to be no exclusive selection*, and yet in the same breath letting out the truth, by telling the deputation that he considered it was rather too bad for the members of the medical profession to come forward and take away *the only little bit of patronage, the prospect of exercising which, would in some measure repay them for the trouble they had taken!* The chairman telling the deputation that they ought to trust to the *honor* of the committee, and that gentlemen ought not to be asked to place on paper their promises,\* that their word should be considered sufficient—and yet by his own speech, convincing all who listened, that with some, both documents and promises were alike forgotten and broken!

At this stage of the proceedings, Mr. Binstead clearly foreseeing that the efficiency of the Institution would suffer, sought a private interview with Mr. Deacon, the Secretary. The result of this interview was, that Mr. Deacon promised to see Mr. W. Grant. The force of Mr. Deacon's arguments prompted Mr. Grant to change his policy, but he broke his promise again, *for he did not resign the chair.* Mr. Garrington

---

\* I always thought the reverse course was the best—viz., that gentlemen should not wait to be asked, but that they should make manifest the integrity of their intentions by placing them on paper, and thus give their word an existence which should endure beyond the moment of its utterance. When a man makes a promise, but refuses to place it on paper, we may be sure he will take the first opportunity to slip out of its fulfilment.



on the part of the medical profession, was invited to meet Mr. Deacon at the residence of Mr. Binstead, for the purpose of discussing the question, and the following resolution was agreed to by all parties :—

“ In reference to the appointment of the Medical Officers, contemplated in the foregoing resolution, it is distinctly understood to be the intention of the Committee, that the services of all such medical men as shall from *time to time* be offered, shall be accepted, and that there shall be no exclusive selection made, the Honorary Officers being subject, in common with the Paid Officers of the Institution, to such general regulations as the Committee of Management may consider necessary.”

A meeting of the Sub-Committee was then called, and the resolution submitted and lost by a majority of *one*. When this was announced from the Chair, the Secretary immediately stated, that he considered it due to his honor to resign his office. He stated that he did this for two reasons ; in the first place, *because he considered that perfect faith had not been kept with the Medical Profession* on the part of the Sub-Committee (referring to their explanatory circular) ; and in the second place, because the Chairman had not supported by his vote, as he had previously promised to do, the amended resolution.\*

It is due to Mr. Grant's consistency to state that he denies having promised to vote, and that Mr. Deacon upon recalling the circumstance, bears him out in this statement. He only promised *to support*. His

---

\* At this meeting Mr. T. E. Owen stated, that he remembered that some kind of *understanding* was come to *originally* with Dr. Engledue with regard to the medical appointments, but that he felt quite sure *no pledge* was given !!



explanation of the circumstance will be found in the *Hampshire Telegraph* of October 14th, 1848.

This then was his position. After originally declaring the doctrine of "free trade" as regards the medical appointments, and submitting to a public meeting resolutions in accordance with this declaration, he changed his mind, and advocated the opposite view. This was change *number one*. After telling the deputation of medical men that their wishes should not be granted—threatening to resign the chair if they were, and assisting in passing a resolution placing the appointment of the medical officers in the Committee of Management, within *twenty-four hours* he changed his mind again, and promised to assist by every means in his power to promote the views of Messrs. Binstead and Deacon. This was change *number two*. At the next meeting of the Sub-Committee he redeemed his pledge, and with a lukewarm support assisted the views of these two gentlemen. When Mr. Deacon expressed his disgust at the whole proceedings, and felt compelled in honor to resign the Honorary office of Secretary, Mr. Grant entreated him to resume his office again, and declared to the Committee that he so completely coincided with the views of Mr. Deacon, that if the Committee would permit the question to be put again from the chair, he would hold up both his hands in its favor. However, when the acts of the Sub-Committee were submitted to the body of the subscribers for approval and confirmation, chameleon-like, he changed his colours again, and the meeting being



composed of individuals who evidently knew nothing about the question beyond what they had been told by him, he threw all the power he possessed as chairman on the side of the question he last declared he had forsaken, and *against which* he had offered to hold up both his hands,—and this was change *number three*.

“What chain can hold this varying Proteus fast?”

Luckily for himself, but unfortunately for the institution, the question has been settled, for how, when, or where, these Jem Crow evolutions would have terminated, is beyond the power of any consistent man to predict. This gentleman seems to be quite oblivious of his own inconsistency, and in the most ridiculous manner imagines that every person is afflicted with the same treacherous memory as himself; for at the last meeting of subscribers, when the question was discussed and settled, he called upon the medical men, now that they were beaten out of their position, to trust to *his* liberal promises to carry out the medical appointments in a proper spirit. He cried out, “Gentlemen, trust to me; when I forsake you, you forsake me!” It is really astonishing with what plausibility some men can stand up and make statements which their previous conduct most completely refutes. They draw largely on their neighbours’ good nature, and calculate more than they are justified in doing, on their forbearance. One would imagine that this gentleman would have been satisfied with his victory, such as it is, and gained as it was by such *conscientious* proceedings, without feeling anxious to renew his appeals, or parade *his* liberal views and *his* just intentions. The



medical men present seemed to consider his appeal a work of supererogation—they very naturally thought that they had experienced quite enough of promises, and were quite willing to forsake him and his brother Committee-men without further trial. How is it possible to trust men who are for ever changing, who reprobate the same men and the same measures they once advocated; who at one time defend principles and at another oppose them; who are wavering, irresolute, unsteady, who approve one part of a system, and condemn another; vibrating for ever between their duty and their interest,—I say, how is it possible to trust such men to carry out the principle for which my professional brethren were contending, without proclaiming to the world one's own imbecility? No. No.

———“To thine ownself be true;  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou can'st not then be false to any man.”

We contended for a principle, and in defence of that principle we were prepared to stand or fall. We contended for what all conscientious men must consider just, and we can afford to suffer a defeat, when that defeat is incurred through the advocacy of a measure calculated to enlist the sympathies of a body of professional men, for the purpose of alleviating the miseries of suffering humanity.

At the next meeting of the medical profession, a committee of five gentlemen was appointed, for the purpose of conducting any arrangements with the Committee of the Hospital, and at this meeting the following resolution was passed:—



*Moved by Mr. Garrington,*

*Seconded by Mr. White,*

“That this meeting, not forgetful that the approval of a man’s own heart is the best and most grateful reward for the conscientious discharge of duty, and that this approval does far more than counterbalance any apparent sacrifice of self-interest which the discharge of that duty seems to imply, is nevertheless desirous to express to Dr. Engledue their warmest thanks for his well-timed and well-directed efforts on the part of the medical profession; and (notwithstanding the charge of mis-statement\* which has been made), their high appreciation of the straightforward and honorable course he has adopted in reference to the proposed medical appointments to the Hospital.”

*Passed unanimously.*

As the period for the general meeting of subscribers to the Hospital approached, the Medical Committee considered it right to issue the following statement:—

“PORTSMOUTH, PORTSEA, AND GOSPORT HOSPITAL.

“We, the undersigned, having been unanimously appointed at a Meeting of the Medical Profession, to conduct the arrangements with the Committee of the Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport Hospital, with reference to the Medical Appointments to the Institution, consider that

---

\* This referred to some discourteous observations made by Dr. Scott at the previous meeting of medical men. He had the effrontery to tell his medical brethren that I had mis-stated the views of the Committee, and he said this after he had assisted to pass the resolution in which the Committee claimed the right to make the appointments. At this meeting he was told by several, that *if* any confirmation of the statements of Dr. Engledue were required, he had furnished it himself, by the illiberal and unjust remarks he had just made on the subject of the medical appointments.



the views entertained by the Medical Men in the District, are not clearly understood by many of the Subscribers. We are therefore anxious to remove all misconception previous to the General Meeting of Subscribers on the 11th day of October next; and to do this, it seems necessary to take a short retrospect.

“When the Sub-Committee of the Hospital commenced their deliberations for the purpose of framing the laws and regulations, the medical men residing in the district met together at the residence of one of their body, and unanimously determined to submit to the Sub-Committee a resolution embodying their views and feelings regarding the appointment of the executive Medical Officers. This resolution was entrusted to Dr. Engledue, one of the Sub-Committee, and he was requested to present the same, and to enforce it by the various arguments which had led to its adoption. This was done. The Sub-Committee thereupon disputing the right of the Profession to meet for the purpose of discussing a matter which they said should be entirely left to the Committee of Management, addressed a circular to each medical man in the district, desiring to be forthwith informed, whether he was disposed to offer his services to the Hospital. On the receipt of this circular, another Meeting of the Profession was held, comprising a very large proportion of the medical practitioners in the district, and it was unanimously resolved, that the Profession as a body, should withhold the offer of their services, until there was an express understanding that no member of the Profession who might now, or at any future period, make an offer of his services, should be placed in the humiliating position of having that offer rejected. This resolution was signed by *twenty-four* medical gentlemen, and transmitted to the Honorary Secretary.

“In answer to this resolution, each gentleman received a long circular, purporting to be an exposition of the views of the Sub-Committee of the Hospital, but which was so ambiguous, that it was considered necessary to call a public meeting of the Profession, to take the same into consideration before returning an answer. At this meeting a deputation was appointed for the purpose of seeking an interview with the Sub-Committee, that so, by giving and receiving explanations, the apparent difficulties might be removed, and the beneficial working of the new Institution ensured. The attainment of this object appeared easy, for the circular letter just referred to stated, that ‘*they* (the Committee) *have always thought, and still think, that there should be no exclusive*



*selection ;*’ and again, ‘The Committee were certainly of opinion, that there appeared to be *no difference* between “the principle enunciated in your resolution” and that recognized by them.’ But at this meeting the real intention of the Sub-Committee was clearly manifested. To the astonishment of the members of the deputation, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee opened the proceedings by declaring that they (the said Sub-Committee) did not approve of the liberal views advocated by the Profession—that he would not sanction the adoption of these views, and that if the majority of the Sub-Committee entertained them favourably and adopted them, he would resign the chair, and take no further interest in the Institution. Notwithstanding this threat, the deputation of Medical Gentlemen entered fully into the views of the Profession, and pointed out how easily a plan might be adopted by which the vigorous working of the Institution might be ensured, and the hearty co-operation of the whole profession secured. It will appear surprising that the same gentlemen who issued the circular letter which stated ‘*that there should be no exclusive selection,*’ returned an answer to the Deputation that in practice they intended the reverse, and were determined to reserve to themselves the right of making the medical appointments. Here is the document. ‘The Sub-Committee having considered the series of resolutions now presented by a Deputation from a Committee of the Members of the Medical Profession, are of opinion that the Appointment of the Medical Officers should rest with the Committee of Management.’

“From the objection taken by the Committee to the proposal of the Medical Profession, it was manifest to Mr. Binstead, one of the members of the Sub-Committee, that the Hospital could not be efficiently conducted. He sought an interview with the Honorary Secretary, and explained his views, and the latter gentleman discussed the matter with the Chairman. Mr. Binstead proposed that Mr. Garrington, one of the Members of the Deputation, should be invited to meet the Honorary Secretary and himself, to talk the matter over. At this private meeting, a resolution was framed which it was hoped would obviate all difficulties, for it had, on the one hand, the sanction of the Chairman, inasmuch as he told the Honorary Secretary that he would agree to the arrangement entered into at the conference, and on the other, it received the unanimous approbation of the Medical Profession. The resolution ran thus :—



“In reference to the appointment of the Medical Officers, contemplated in the foregoing resolution, it is distinctly understood to be the intention of the Committee, that the services of all such medical men as shall from *time to time* be offered, shall be accepted, and that there shall be no exclusive selection made, the Honorary Officers being subject, in common with the Paid Officers of the Institution, to such general regulations as the Committee of Management may consider necessary.”

“A meeting of the Sub-Committee was then called, and the resolution submitted and lost by a majority of *one*. When this was announced from the chair, the Secretary immediately stated, that he considered it due to his honor to resign his office. He stated that he did this for two reasons ; in the first place, because he considered that perfect faith had not been kept with the Medical Profession on the part of the Sub-Committee (referring to their explanatory circular) ; and in the second place, because the Chairman had not supported by his vote, as he had previously promised to do, the amended resolution.

“The members of the Hospital Committee were told at their last meeting, that the Medical Men and the Sub-Committee who framed the laws, ‘*mean the same thing.*’ How can this be? The Sub-Committee of the Hospital say, ‘Send in your names, you who are anxious to render your *gratuitous* services, and we will out of your number select as many as we want to perform the duties of the Institution.’ The Medical Men say, ‘a certain number of our body are willing and ready to render their gratuitous services to the Institution, and they will arrange amongst themselves the plan by which this shall be accomplished, but they cannot sanction a plan which exposes any one of their number to the chance of rejection from the members of the present or any future Committee of Management.’ In the one case there is a selection which, excluding some, must of necessity be invidious ;—in the other case, all those gentlemen who have promised to perform certain duties, are left to do so in a manner accordant with their own wishes, always understanding that they are subject to such general regulations as the Committee of Management may consider necessary.

“It has been urged as an argument against the recognition of our principle, that no Hospital in the United Kingdom is conducted on the



same plan. Let this be conceded—what then? If this be a valid argument, the same may hold good with regard to any proposed alteration of an old-established plan, and thus a barrier erected for the purpose of preventing all progress. As a body of independent Medical Men, we claim an individual and collective right to name the terms on which our *gratuitous* services are to be obtained; and we do this, not as an offensive proceeding, but as a right, which we contend no body of gentlemen out of the profession, have any authority to call in question. Of course it is quite competent for the Managers of an Institution to decline the *gratuitous* services which they have solicited, and there, as a natural consequence, the matter ends. As a body of Professional Men we are not anxious to increase our gratuitous labours, but we are quite ready to fulfil our duty; since, however, this duty is unremunerative, we must be permitted to perform it in the manner most agreeable to ourselves.

“In conclusion, we again repudiate the charge of having any desire to interfere in the general management of the Institution; and we equally repudiate the imputation that the object of the combination of the Medical Men is either ‘to coerce the Committee, or the body of Subscribers, to the adoption of a new and untried system, or to prevent the Hospital from being opened and carried on for the benefit of the afflicted poor.’”

“R. WHITE,

“J. GREETHAM,

“W. H. GARRINGTON,

“W. C. ENGLEDEUE,

“R. G. F. SMITH.”

---

But I will now proceed with the record of these extraordinary proceedings, by giving an account of a few of the matters discussed at the last meeting of subscribers, because, if any where, here at least, one would suppose, would be heard the objections raised against the position of the medical profession. As to argument, there was none. The assertions, as is usual in



such cases, were in the inverse ratio. "We will have our way, because we have the power. We have the right (?), and we will exercise it. All other institutions are conducted as we intend to conduct this, and therefore the good old plan must be the best. Your plan has never been tried, and we therefore assume that it cannot answer. There is no precedent for your innovation, &c."

What was the proposition of the medical profession? Let us consider whether there was anything so very outrageous in their position, that it would have been a sacrifice of principle on the part of the subscribers to the Hospital to have permitted them to test the practicability of their plan. The Public Dispensary was to be united with the Hospital, it was therefore necessary to obtain the services of an efficient staff for both departments. Some of the gentlemen connected with the dispensary had rendered their services for *twenty-five* years, and had assisted during that period in relieving about 20,000 distressed individuals. They had never received fee or reward for these services. *They never wished for either.* An opportunity at length arrived, when the gratitude of the public could be shown to this body of gentlemen, by acceding to their request of uniting with their brethren, and arranging for themselves their plan of attendance on the sick poor. The man who trusts to public gratitude, trusts to a broken reed. For his public acts, the approval of his own conscience is the standard to which he should appeal, and the monitor which should direct his proceedings. With the great bulk of society, life



is merely the following of a few inferior instincts, with a perfect blindness as to consequences. Selfishness is the ruling passion of the majority, and it is shown on every trivial opportunity. Even, as in this instance, when the public ask a favor, it is the dominant passion, and they cannot forego the gratification of attempting to control the gratuitous services of a body of gentlemen they cannot afford to pay. The individuals who place their names on the subscription list of the Hospital for a guinea, which assists in purchasing the medicines and food for the inmates, think they have a right to command and control the services of the gentlemen by whose labour and skill the sick man is to be raised up again, and rendered a useful member of society. If this position be denied—if they declare that they have no wish to command the services of the professional man, by what right do they arrogate to themselves the power of first inviting the services of all, and of then selecting out of a given number, just those they may please? If they wish for power, let them pay for it. If they wish to select and appoint, to command and control, by all means let them do so, but first let them do that which is just and honest; let them go into the labour market, and be prepared to pay the price which is demanded. Under such circumstances, no one would dispute their right. But to subscribe a sum of money for the purpose of alleviating the diseases of their poor neighbours, which money they cannot expend for themselves without the assistance of the medical profession, *and thus obtain the credit of a charitable action by the unpaid exertions of*



*others*—why, one would really imagine the slightest reflection would have prompted them to obey the great command “Do unto others, as ye would they should do unto you,” and that in the true spirit of justice they would have met the wishes of the Profession, not only without a murmur, but with becoming thankfulness and gratitude.

I have just said, that it was necessary to secure the services of the gentlemen connected with the Dispensary, and at the same time to arrange a plan, by means of which, the attendance on the patients in the Hospital could be made agreeable to themselves, as well as to their brethren who had not been connected with the Dispensary. The members of the Profession considered that this object was to be gained, by carrying out in its integrity, the *third* resolution passed at the first public meeting. They therefore asked for a formal recognition of the principle in the laws of the Institution. As they were *invited* to render their gratuitous services, they felt that it was due to the honor and dignity of their profession, that they should have this fundamental point clearly and definitively settled.

The plan proposed was this. Although the whole Profession had united for the purpose of obtaining the recognition of the principle, it was ascertained that not more than *twelve* gentlemen would express a wish to be connected with the Hospital and Dispensary. These twelve gentlemen, therefore, having the duties to perform, it was proposed that they should meet together to arrange a plan of procedure, which, while it would



be conducive to the efficient working of the Institution, would also promote good feeling and combined exertions. In carrying out this there could be no difficulty. In a few words, here is a sketch of the plan. Let the twelve gentlemen meet together, and arrange their names according to seniority. For the present Hospital, *three* medical men would form an efficient staff, consequently, there would have been *nine* medical men left for the Dispensary arrangements. The island, therefore, could have been divided into nine districts, and the probable number of patients visited at their own houses, averaging at present between two and three hundred, would have given about *thirty* patients per annum to each medical officer. The arrangement for the attendance on the out-patients *at* the Hospital would have been easily settled. It was proposed that the three first gentlemen on the list should have attended at the Hospital for the first year, and that on the 31st of December next, they should have retired, and the three next on the list take their places, the three former taking the places of the latter in the Dispensary. The three gentlemen who retired from the Hospital, would *not have given over to their successors* the patients they were treating, but would have continued their attendance on them *till* they were discharged, the three new medical officers receiving only the *new patients as they were admitted*. Of course, on this point, the method for changing the Dispensary patients would have been the same. Thus we see, if the number of medical officers were twelve—in *four* years they would all have taken their turn in the



Hospital and Dispensary arrangements, and the list would be commenced again.\*

We did not claim for ourselves what we were not prepared to yield to our neighbours, we therefore demanded, that every legally qualified practitioner coming to reside in the district, by intimating his wish to the Committee, should be permitted to place his name at the bottom of the list, and take his turn in the duties of the Institution with his brethren.† This fresh infusion of strength would have filled the vacancies caused by death, or by the retirement or removal of individuals. It was very necessary to have a clear understanding on this point, because, if it were not settled, it was merely driving off the discussion to a future day. If it were not settled at the commencement, it was in the power of the Committee to refuse the application of all new residents, and thus, in the

---

\* In the report of the Hospital meeting contained in the *Hampshire Telegraph*, I am reported to have said, that the medical officers proposed changing their plan of attendance every *three* months. This is a mistake. My suggestion was, that they should change once a year. It is a matter of very little moment, because the principle holds good, whether the change was to be effected every three, six, nine, or twelve months. At Southampton the change of medical officers is effected *once a week!* At Brecon the same arrangement is carried out. Another mistake of the reporter was making my friend, Mr. Binstead, *say exactly the reverse of what he did say*. I merely mention this, incidentally, because I have heard the speech referred to, and quoted as an argument against the position of my brethren.

† The Committee were opposed to this, and declared that they would not allow a new resident to join the Hospital staff without their express sanction. They contended, that it was necessary for the new medical man to reside in the town for some time, that his *moral character* might be tested, &c.—Now behold their consistency! They have appointed two medical men who had not resided in the town previously. One had never been in private practice, but was called upon by a *clerical member* of the Committee, and requested as a favor, to permit his name to be placed on the staff, —and the other *was not even residing in the town at the period of his appointment!*



course of a few years, the Hospital staff would degenerate into a monopoly of three or four, which was the very thing we laboured to prevent. The Committee were evidently anxious for this, for they proposed a compromise. They hinted that they might be disposed to yield the point as regards the medical men at present living in the towns, but not as regards future residents. Enter into a compromise upon a principle! These compromises may be considered right and proper by those who do not scruple to adopt the tricks and evasions of modern every-day life. The morality of the day would have permitted this, as it did permit without a censure, the gross tergiversation exposed in the preceding pages—but could any moral man enter into a compromise with what he considered unjust? Could any honorable and generous man consent to live with injustice all around him—with monstrous injustice as the very basis of *his* distinction, and that injustice capable of a remedy?

In opposition to this plan of the medical profession, what was the plan of the Hospital Committee? They issued a circular to each medical man, and asked him if he were willing to render his gratuitous services to the Hospital. Before returning an answer to this circular, the medical men demanded information as to their plan for making the medical appointments. They were assured by the Committee that there was to be no exclusive selection. However, they did not feel satisfied, and sent a deputation to confer with the Com-

---

\* DR. SCOTT WAS A MEMBER OF THIS COMMITTEE.



mittee, when the Committee passed a formal resolution, *contradicting their former asseveration*, and claiming for themselves the right of making the medical appointments. In one sense, this answer was quite satisfactory, because it was evident, that if twelve gentlemen returned an affirmative answer to the invitation, the Committee of Management claimed the power of *selecting* out of that number, just whom they pleased. They pretended to throw open the Institution, but paradoxical enough claimed the right of election—they told us that they agreed in the “*principle which we had enunciated*,” and in the same breath declared, that we should not attend in accordance with that principle—on paper they wished us to believe, that they would be as liberal as we could desire, but in practice, they claimed the right of resorting to the old borough-mongering system of jesuitically appearing to throw open the advantages to all, but of letting in only just whom they pleased. And were we a body of professional men to submit to such terms? Were we to run the risk of being driven to that detestable system of canvassing our neighbours for leave to perform the daily duties of an eleemosynary Institution? For it must have come to this. The appointments were to rest in the Committee of Management, composed of twelve individuals *to be elected annually*. Were the twelve of the succeeding year to be always guided by the actions of the twelve of the preceding year? Under such a system, without a distinct pledge, in the shape of a law passed at the foundation of the Institution, let any man say, how long a just policy would have



been pursued. The Committee ultimately inserted an advertisement in the public papers, requesting all medical men who wished to be connected with the Hospital, to send in their names. *There was but one application*, and this was from the individual who had, from the first moment, opposed the wishes of his brethren.

Now, I unhesitatingly ask what possible objection can there be to the plan of the medical profession being tried? If at the end of the first year the subscribers did not think the plan succeeded, it was in their power to meet together—to rescind the law, and there the matter ended. I ask what have the medical men in the district done to cause the inhabitants to refuse their request? It cannot be supposed that they wished this plan to be adopted without good and sufficient reasons—what were they? Is it not quite evident that I, who had originated the movement for the establishment of the Hospital, could have been appointed one of the medical attendants, if I had considered it just that the old monopolizing system should be adopted? To the worldly grub who cannot raise himself above the infinitesimal littleness of mere personal considerations—who cannot assist in carrying out a philanthropic object without descending into the strife and self-seekings of our social scene—who cannot stretch forth his hand to rescue from sickness and misery his poor neighbour without doing an act of injustice to others, and thus neutralizing and casting a doubt over the motives which prompted him to stand forth—to such a man, there can be no doubt my ac-



tions will denote weakness, and my views will be denounced again, as they have been before, "Utopian and visionary in the extreme." With such a man I have no sympathy. He is *of* the world, but he is not *for* the world. I feel pity for him in his position, and regret his short-comings,—the *world* admires his cunning, and in beholding the success of his selfish efforts, loses sight of the dirt through which he has crawled, and with which in my opinion he will be for ever soiled.

I repeat what I have stated in public over and over again, that I will never take for myself what I am not prepared to give my neighbour an opportunity of possessing, and I declare that my only motive in pursuing the course in which I have been defeated, was the promotion of good feeling in my profession, and as a result of this an united effort to carry out the real object of the proposed Institution. In this matter I say it without boast, for it is wrung from me, *ex necessitate rei*, that I stood up for justice, for equal rights and equal privileges. I wished not to bolster myself up with advantages which were not enjoyed equally by all my brethren. I entered on the race of life free and unfettered, and free and unfettered I will remain. No man shall point the finger of scorn at me, and declare that in my social career, I took that which I did not use my best exertions to give him an opportunity of possessing. I will run the race, and I will use my best endeavours to win, but it shall be on fair and equal terms. I will take nothing from the world which is not honestly, truly, and manfully



earned. These are my feelings, my *weaknesses*. They may be designated Utopian—visionary—Quixotic, or anything else the reader may please, there is at any rate this quality attached to them—they cannot be disrobed of the dignity of reason—the dignity of truth. I have reason to know that in stating these sentiments for myself, I am writing down the thoughts of my brethren. At the several meetings which have taken place there was no difference of opinion. They claimed what they considered their right. They asked for nothing more than what they considered just. They all declared that there was no other possible way by which the Institution could be efficiently conducted and their own dignity and self-respect guaranteed. Who knew so well as medical men the difficulties of their position? Who were to feel the annoyance but themselves, when a body of gentlemen consider it *their right* to select one, two, or three, and for the carrying out a charitable object, declare, these are the men in our opinion most fitted for the distinction? Who knew better than themselves, that these appointments are ALWAYS obtained by private canvass,\* and that on the day of election it is not the most meritorious, not

---

\* The system of canvassing for these appointments is a disgraceful and degrading system. The man who petitions to be appointed to an office, where his services are gratuitous, but which office, as in the case of the Hospital, is to be made the stepping stone to his own professional advancement; and by the adoption of this vicious system, if he be successful in his efforts, shuts out from the same opportunity, his professional brethren, alike forgets his own self-respect, and the dignity which is due to the profession of which he is a member. It is no excuse to say, it is the custom. If we consider the appeal to custom an argument, we may adopt any kind of policy, and feel quite certain that we shall have plenty of companions—*such as they are*.



the most scientific, not the most skilful, who are selected, but the men who can command the most votes by the machinery which they have put in motion for months, and even years? Who were to feel the degradation of their position but the men who were rejected? If there be no distinction—no *eclat* to be gained by such an appointment, why has one individual stood aloof from the whole of his professional brethren, and thus cast himself into the arms of the Committee of Management? If his motives are just, why has he accepted an office contrary to the express wishes of his brethren, and in the duties of which a large proportion were willing to assist? If his intentions are not selfish, why has he been found wanting in that *esprit de corps* which is so essential for the promotion and developement of professional rights? *Is it not a notorious fact that he has now taken an office analogous to that which three years ago he declined, his letter of resignation as an officer of the Public Dispensary stating, that from increasing private practice he had no longer the leisure to attend to the sick poor?* If then his views are pure, why has he now taken a position which he so recently declined, and for

---

Recently an election for a Physician to the Bedford Infirmary took place. There were four candidates. The gentleman by whose resignation the vacancy occurred, sold his practice, which lay chiefly amongst the subscribers to the Infirmary, to a stranger, and of course used all his influence to obtain the appointment for his successor. The stranger was elected. This was accomplished by private influence, *and chiefly by the proxies of the ladies.* Of course such a proceeding is very complimentary to the medical gentlemen residing in the Town, and cannot fail to be satisfactory to them. It speaks highly for the system which is pursued for the purpose of obtaining these appointments, and affords another *precedent* to those who set a value upon such effectual drag-chains.



which there were many candidates, all *at least* as good, and as well qualified as he? It is no excuse for him to appeal to the fact that he has *now* three coadjutors in his selfish career. One, Dr. Mortimer, declares to all his brethren, that he has nothing to do with the Hospital—that his name has been placed on the staff without his authority, and yet, paradoxical enough, he refuses to contradict the public announcement; and as to the other two, nobody knows them—they are strangers to the place, strangers to the profession, strangers to the inhabitants,—and they have taken the offices which those who were well known declined, for the reasons just enumerated. The position which these gentlemen have taken up, is of course quite open to comment. Let them make whatever excuses they may consider expedient, there is still the fact remaining, that instead of supporting their professional brethren in the course which they considered right and just, they took the opportunity of *creeping* into offices, which under other circumstances their position would have never obtained for them, and thus performing an action which I should think and trust the majority of individuals would consider very far removed from good taste and high principle.

It has been stated, that the medical men required what their professional brethren in other towns have never enjoyed, and that it was impossible to bring forward a single precedent which could authorize the subscribers to the Hospital to adopt their suggestions. This was advanced by several, and reiterated again and again, *usque ad nauseam*, by the chairman of the Com-



mittee, and applauded by the gentlemen who voted on this disgraceful occasion. Mr. J. Hoskins, the late mayor, *whose signature was appended to the original resolutions*, took this view, and as his speech seemed to produce an effect upon the meeting, I will quote from the *Hampshire Telegraph* the following portion:—

Mr. Rolph said, “The main argument which had been used against the amendment was, that it was a novelty, that it had not the sanction of practice, or the recommendation of experience. But the objection had invariably been urged against every advance and improvement in science. This bar against improvement would have prevented our ocean from being traversed by steam-ships, and our land intersected with railroads. It was true, that it wanted great strength of mind to throw off the trammels of habit and custom, &c., &c.”

To this speech Mr. J. Hoskins replied; “He agreed with much that Mr. Rolph had said about progressive improvements, but steam-boats and railroads had superseded sailing vessels and coaches, because they were superior to them, because sailing vessels and coaches were found inferior to railroads and steamers; but he would ask, where had this *new principle* which the medical men advocated, shewn its superiority over the old principle? He had asked repeatedly, where had the old principle failed? *Where had the new principle which was now advocated proved superior to the old? &c., &c.*”

This is a specimen of police-court logic—it is just the kind of sophistry which produces an effect on the intellect of a petty-jury, which, too frequently captivated by the smartness and assurance of a special pleader, loses sight altogether of his fallacious ratiocination, and returns a verdict in accordance with the view he has cunningly made appear to it to be the truth. I thought that the objection to the plan was, and still is, its novelty, “there is no precedent” was the cry. I presume railroads and steamers did not manifest their



superiority till they had been tried, how then could these means of locomotion, which have been tried and proved, be brought forward as an argument *against* a plan of procedure, which had not been tried and proved? How could the plan advocated by the medical men *prove* its superiority, if it were not permitted to have a trial? How could the same individual oppose a plan *because* there was no precedent, and in the same breath cry out, “*Where* has this new principle shewn its superiority over the old principle?” And yet this trash was received with great applause. When the combined intellect of the assembled individuals manifested its *calibre* by permitting such transparent fallacies to call forth cheers, I marvel not at the higher faculties of the same assemblage permitting the return of an adverse verdict to the trial of a plan, which in my opinion would soon prove its superiority, *because* it is in accordance with the great principles of justice and right.

It was a conclusion to which most men could have probably arrived *a priori*, that legal gentlemen would naturally fall back on a precedent. Several did this, but it is to Mr. J. Hoskins the credit is due of insisting very strongly on the necessity of introducing the practice of his profession into the settlement of a simple question of justice and right, and by this course he proved that he and his brethren were not prepared to discuss the question on its merits, but that true to the parchment and red tape routine, they must fall back on a musty precedent. This was the lowest possible ground on which the question could be



placed, it was introducing the practice of the courts of law,—where everybody knows that too often what legal men consider *law*, is very far removed from what moral men consider *equity*,—and by this very procedure, it was in my opinion virtually yielding the victory to the plaintiffs. It is to me on all occasions a sickening sight to behold these gentlemen jumping up and arresting the progress of real improvements with their expostulations—“I question if you have the right to do this.” “You have no power to effect that.” “There is no *precedent* for your adopting this course.” “There is *no authority* for your following the other course,” &c.,—all which being interpreted means, that we ought to continue in the good old jog-trot routine which our great-grandfathers thought right or expedient, and had better not infringe the rules or pervert the plans which our ancestors in their wisdom considered good and sufficient for their guidance. But, *Commenta seculorum delet dies*. It was certainly a laughable matter in the present instance, to observe the ease with which these gentlemen cast aside the real merits of the question, and the self-satisfaction which they displayed when they insisted on the necessity of observing prescribed rules and formulæ. Laugh, who could avoid it? Laugh we must—

“When in the same dull round we see them creep,  
 Profoundly trifling, profitlessly deep,  
 Treading the steps their sires before them trod,  
 The past their heaven, antiquity their God,—  
 Like mouldering mammoths, who unmoved have stood,  
 Sealed in some muddy cavern since the flood;  
 When we see those who ought the lead to take,  
 Strangling improvement like a pois’nous snake,  
 The grain rejecting to be gorged with chaff;—  
 Shade of Democritus! who would not laugh?”



The idea of the men of the present age appealing to a precedent, when even in their own day so many gigantic improvements have taken place while the little intellects of the many were crying out "*impossible*," and declaring that no "*precedent*" could be quoted for the efforts of the daring intruder. The shallow pates are ever the obstructives. Incapable of originating a thought of any magnitude for their own or their neighbour's *real* improvement, they are employed in fluttering through their little day and crying down what they can neither understand nor appreciate, or what their selfish and grasping propensities prompt them to imagine may become inimical to their own interests. It is thus in matters appertaining to the physical world—it is similar with matters belonging to the moral world. Where is the man who has advanced a scheme for the improvement of his fellow man without having to fight his way step by step against the prejudices of his compeers, and having to remove too often single-handed, the obstructions wantonly placed in his path by those who should have been foremost in rendering him assistance? All schemes are denounced by such men as visionary—all innovators are presumed by such men to have emigrated from the land of Utopia, and they continue their opposition for years, thus conducting themselves like cattle in a field towards a newly-erected rubbing-post—for they are at first frightened—then shy—then a little bold—and at last becoming familiarized with the intrusion they very quietly put the thing to its proper use. Yes, the dial of the world is moved on by those whom the world



persecutes. The pioneers are the martyrs. When the millions reap the advantages previously shadowed forth by the few, then they begin to think how vile their treatment has been; and when the brains which gave birth to the propelling thoughts, have been resolved into their elements and the men no longer live, then their memories are worshipped and the marble pile is reared to denote that *such men* once lived.

But if legal men failed on the day of trial, who could have imagined that the gentlemen of the clerical profession would have neglected the opportunity of teaching what is just, and of enforcing the great precept of charity in another way than the giving of alms. Here was a glorious opportunity to teach by example the precept they are so constantly enforcing. Here was an occasion when they might have used the influence they possess, and by this means have taught the public that they at any rate would not countenance a real injustice, albeit the ignorance and selfishness of the many prompted them to declare it expedient. I hate your expediency-mongers. It is never expedient to be unjust. It cannot be expedient for a committee of gentlemen to invite *a body* of professional men to do a certain piece of work—to tell them in a printed letter that there is to be *no exclusive selection*, and within a few days to pass a resolution, which declared that there should be an exclusive selection. It cannot be expedient for a committee of gentlemen to refuse the wish of the Profession that new residents, having the legal qualifications, should be permitted to attend the Hospital and Dispensary when their turn arrived, and



within a few weeks *to do the very thing they declared they would not do*—the chairman of the said committee not resigning the chair, as he declared he would, if this point were conceded! It cannot be considered expedient for the chairman to alter his opinions *three times on a point of principle within a few weeks*, and to be permitted to do this without one check from his party, but apparently, rather encouraged by this absence of rebuke, pursuing his course without shame and without remorse.

When the question was put to the vote at the meeting of subscribers, all the clergy *present*, with but one exception, the Rev. Mr. Hawkes,\* voted against the request of the medical men. Let this never be forgotten. Let it never be forgotten that the medical profession *received an invitation*, and as they could not all attend at the Hospital at the same time, they merely asked to be permitted to arrange a roster for themselves—separating their attendance on the indoor from their attendance on the out-door patients, and taking turns once a year in doing this,—and thus by dividing the labour they thought they should afford the poor the best attendance in their power, and at the

---

\*“When it had been stated that the whole of the Medical Profession had declared that they wished to be under their own regulations, subject to the general government of the Institution, he thought they ought to be allowed to do so, since their services were offered gratuitously. He thought it on their part a handsome, gentlemanly offer, which should be received in a similar spirit. Even *if* their offer were an ill-judged one, he thought it ought not to be at once peremptorily rejected; and he wished to meet the medical men in the same handsome manner in which he conceived they had proposed their offer.”—*Hampshire Telegraph*, Oct. 14, 1848.—  
“Speech of Rev. Mr. Hawkes.”



same time render the duties congenial to the tastes and wishes of their body. This plan was rejected by a majority of 43 against 6, and avowedly rejected because there was no precedent. Why if precedents are to be the order of the day, there was a lofty and comprehensive one to which I have before referred, and of which a stereotyped impression should be for ever before us—its practical exemplification was contained in the excellent appeal of my friend Mr. Binstead to his legal brethren, when he pointed out to them the justice of our demand, and asked them if they were in a similar position, whether they would not make a similar request, and expect a like indulgence.

But how did the clergy act when the appointment of a Chaplain to the Hospital was discussed? Here is the law which *they* proposed. It was done *privately*, but it was their work.

“The salary of the chaplain shall be £25 per annum.” “The salary of the Chaplain shall be paid out of funds to be derived from collections to be made at the several churches, and the *residue* of such collections shall be applied to the general objects of the institution.”

Now I ask, where is the *precedent* for this proceeding? Precedents are not necessary it appears, when *self* is concerned. These remnants of past days—these records of a period, when the efforts of men were shamelessly individual and grasping, are only to be quoted when it is necessary to put down an attempt to return a better state of feeling, and a more comprehensive definition of the term duty. In other towns, the clergy preach sermons at their several churches, and pay over the proceeds to the Charity, but in the



town of Portsmouth, the amount collected is to pay toll—the salary of the Chaplain is to be first stopped, and the residue is then to find its way into the Hospital Exchequer. The public is to raise funds, and with the gratuitous aid of the medical profession these funds are to be expended. The clergy are to preach for the Charity and to ask for alms, and there their charity is to end. They will not visit the poor man on his bed of sickness in the Hospital, without being paid for it, at the rate of about 3s. 2½d. per visit! Let it never be forgotten, when these annual calls are made, when the advantages of *the* Charity are displayed, and the great necessity of charity enforced, that probably, a *fourth* part of the several collections finds its way into the pocket of one of the pleaders. This is bad enough, but it is not all. Will it be believed, that within five minutes after they had all voted against the request of the medical men, they stood up to a man and voted for the confirmation of the laws, one of the laws authorizing them to pay themselves, and thus assisted in forming the majority of 43.\* And this was in the

---

\*“ The Rev. Mr. Milner addressed the meeting relative to the observations of Dr. Engledue with regard to the payment of the chaplain. There was a great difference between the two professions—the medical man had a right to say he would attend the Hospital or not, whilst the clerical man was not his own master, but must attend to his peculiar district. The clergy would do their duty. All they asked was that the Committee should appoint one as a Chaplain, and it should not cost them a farthing. The Rev. Mr. Snooke addressed a few remarks to the same effect.”—*Hampshire Telegraph*, Oct. 14, 1848.

Did these gentlemen ever reflect on this fact that £25 is exactly the expense of one bed in the Hospital, supposing it is always full, and that by their deducting this sum from the amount collected at the several churches, they most likely prevent from twelve to fifteen poor persons from being received into the Hospital every year? Do these gentlemen mean to state that it was not in the power of the Clergy to



cause of charity! It certainly was not within the bounds of modesty. I have no hesitation in denouncing it as a job. It was a job perpetrated under the worst possible circumstances, because it was a private arrangement before the meeting took place. If it were not a compact between the two parties, they ought to have repudiated the idea the moment it was mentioned; but at any rate, the fact of the clergy seizing the proffered fee when it was offered, defending the job when it was exposed, and voting against those who had worked for years, and were still to work gratuitously, indicates in my opinion, a recklessness as regards the true interpretation of the term charity, and a disposition to bow down before the idol it is their duty and their daily habit to denounce.

The real truth is, that this plan was adopted for the purpose of preventing the Dissenters, who form two-thirds of the population, from finding fault with the appointment of a Chaplain. The Committee knew

---

adopt the same plan as that suggested by the medical men, and that thus by forming a roster for themselves, and taking turns, they might perform their duties in the Institution without incurring any very great amount of labour, and without receiving the small gratuity for which they have now stipulated?

The Rev. Mr. Snooke was the most energetic amongst the Clergy in denouncing any attempt to meet the wishes of the members of the Medical Profession. He is appointed Chaplain to the Hospital. This gentleman enforced the necessity of keeping the medical men in subjection by vesting the appointment of the Medical Officers in the hands of the Committee, and illustrated his position on the necessity of a controlling power by referring to the horrible revolutionary scenes which had recently occurred in France:—thus, I presume, comparing the Medical Men of Portsmouth to the Red-Republicans of Paris, and the benevolent actions of the former while alleviating the miseries of the poor, to the riotous proceedings of the latter in their attempts to wrest power from the government.



quite well, that if they appointed a Chaplain, and paid him *directly* out of the funds of the Institution, the Dissenters would object to the plan, because a portion of the money which they subscribed would necessarily go towards the payment of an individual for the performance of a duty, which they were quite willing to assist in performing without payment. The Church party had just passed through a similar difficulty at the Penitentiary. Here they wished to appoint a Chaplain, but they were outvoted, and they therefore withdrew their support from the Charity. Accordingly, in the case of the Hospital, they hit upon the sly expedient of appointing a Chaplain, and *without a precedent*—unheard of proceeding!—they passed a law setting forth how he was to be paid,—thus dictating how money was to be expended, before it came into their possession, and as they could not *command or appoint* the clergy to preach the sermons—over which money, they necessarily had no control! The intimation that appeals are to be made by the clergy in aid of a charity is generally announced in hand-bills, I would therefore suggest the propriety of always stating in the annual announcement, that sermons will be preached at the several churches in aid of a fund for the payment of the Chaplain to the Hospital, and for defraying the other expenses incidental to the support of the Institution. If this be not done, I am sure the legal gentlemen will say, that not only is there no precedent for the course pursued, but they will declare, that the purpose for which the money was collected was not carried out, and they will be quite right, for



who would suppose *a priori* that a sermon preached in aid of the funds of the Hospital, implied the fact that £25 was to be stopped for the payment of one of the pleaders. *Proh pudor!* If the antiquated weakness of blushing were not quite out of fashion, it would be an interesting exhibition to witness the effect of this statement on the cheeks of those who were the parties to propose and to carry out this mean and disgraceful arrangement.

At the last meeting of subscribers, I divided the meeting on this question, and there was a majority of 39 votes in favor of the payment of the Chaplain, and by the means proposed! What I objected to, was this. In the first place, I thought the Chaplain should, like the medical men, perform his duty gratuitously, and in the second place, I considered that the Committee, if they appointed a Chaplain, had no right to pass a law authorizing the clergy to stop the salary for themselves, before paying the proceeds of their collections into the Hospital exchequer. This is the fact, however interested parties may endeavour to explain it away. If the amount collected at the churches is carried first to the general fund of the Hospital, and then the salary of the Chaplain paid—*there was no occasion for the law*, for the salary necessarily comes out of the general fund. But if the amount collected is paid into one hand of the Treasurer, and before he carries his amount to the general fund, he, with the other hand, pays the Chaplain, then it is quite clear that he is paying away money which does not belong to the Institution, which, of course, he has no power to do, and



it is virtually giving the power to the clergy to stop their gratuity, for the interview between their Treasurer and the Treasurer to the Hospital is merely *pro forma*. If the public think, that the clergy ought not to take turns in their attendance at the Hospital, but that one individual should be selected for the performance of the duty, and that he should be paid, let the salary come directly from the general fund, but by no means let any party stop any portion of the money collected for a specific purpose, before it reaches its destination, In its present shape, the matter looks ugly. It seems as if the clergy had said, we will not preach for your charity, if you do not sanction our paying the Chaplain, by appropriating a portion of the proceeds of our collections,—“It shall not cost you anything,”\* for what you do not receive you cannot expend. What kind, considerate, disinterested souls ! And these are the gentlemen who oppose the wishes of the medical profession, who are to work *without fee and without reward*, and who, according to one of their own number, “ought to be put down.”†

At the last meeting of subscribers several gentlemen suggested the possibility of the Hospital being opened

---

\* The Rev. Mr. Milner's speech.

† A Clergyman residing within the walls of Portsmouth, when discussing the question of the Medical Appointments with a friend of mine, said, that “*it was quite time the Doctors were put down.*” As to his meaning there can be no doubt, but it would puzzle him to give an intelligible reason why the Medical Men were to be crushed. To my certain knowledge there is not one amongst them who does not do more for the poor in one day than he does in a month ; and why, therefore, he was to take upon himself to suggest the necessity of “putting down” the workers, who were all merely asking leave to increase their labour, is beyond my power to divine.



without a sufficient number of medical officers. They were assured by the Chairman of the Hospital Committee that they had secured an efficient medical staff. After this public announcement, the medical gentlemen who had charge of the Dispensary, and who felt that good faith had not been kept with them, immediately sent in their resignations, and instead of throwing the work of the Dispensary, as I think they ought to have done, immediately on the "efficient medical staff"—they wrote to the Secretary of the Hospital and begged that he would make arrangements to relieve them of their duties *in a fortnight*. This considerate treatment, like all the previous motives and actions of the medical men, was misinterpreted, and the editor of the *Hampshire Telegraph* having inserted some comments which the late Dispensary officers felt were untrue, the senior member of their body wrote the following letter to the editor; and as the charge against them had been widely circulated, a copy was sent to the other local papers. The editor of the *Hampshire Telegraph* promised to insert it, but he did not keep his promise, and when he was called upon and requested to insert it as an advertisement, he refused this request also. I insert the letter here because I agree with every word therein contained, and because I know that all the statements are true.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HAMPSHIRE TELEGRAPH.

SIR,—Relying on your well-known impartiality and love of justice, I trust you will permit me to occupy a small space in your valuable paper, while I endeavour to vindicate myself and my colleagues, late of the Portsmouth, Portsea and Gosport General Dispensary, from the



charges brought against us in a notice which appeared in the *Hampshire Telegraph* of last week. We are therein accused, first, of hostility to the new Hospital, and, secondly, of shewing our hostility in an unfeeling way. These charges are grounded on the facts, that, as a body, the medical men of this district have declined to offer their gratuitous services to the charity, and that we, who have been officiating as the temporary medical staff, have resigned our appointments.

*We have no hostility to the Hospital*—we supported it by our contributions, by our influence, by our professional services; and we are quite ready and willing still to support and assist it with all our power. We have simply demanded the fulfilment of the promise made to us at the first meeting of the Hospital, that all the qualified medical practitioners residing in the districts should be invited to render their services to the institution. We have not been desirous to interfere at all with the general management—we have not claimed to be exempt from any of the regulations which the Committee may frame (or have framed) for its proper government—we do not, for a moment, contemplate that the medical-staff should, in any way, be placed above the controul of the governing body—we simply ask that every medical gentleman should be permitted, if he desire it, to share in the advantages (if there be any) which the institution can offer to him in return for the efficient discharge of his professional duties. The medical-staff of the late Dispensary, believing that the promises made to the medical profession at the preliminary meeting of the Hospital above alluded to would be held sacred, consented to remain in office till the arrangements of the Hospital were complete, and for the last four months have continued to discharge their duties; but when it was found that the subscribers to the charity refused to fulfil the promise which had been held out to the profession, no other course was open to us than to withdraw the support which had been obtained under false impressions, and to withhold the offer of further services.

The second charge, that we had shewn our hostility in a somewhat unfeeling way, is endeavoured to be substantiated by the assertion, that the Committee of the Hospital were humanely apprehensive that sufficient time could not be afforded, between the receipt of our letter and the 1st of November, to make such arrangements as would secure due professional attendance to the patients. I am quite at a loss to conceive



how the statement can be reconciled with the oft-repeated assertions (repeated so often, and in such a tone, as to bear strong resemblance to a taunt to the great body of the medical profession), that the Committee of the Hospital had an efficient medical staff. If this statement were true, surely neither could the act of resigning our duties into efficient hands be regarded as unfeeling to the patients, nor the notice, of at least a fortnight's length, that their services would be required, so short as to be unfeeling to the medical staff. We felt compelled, in justice to ourselves and our professional brethren, to withdraw from every connexion with an institution so widely different in principle from the one we were led to believe we were supporting, as soon as we could do so without incurring the risk of adding to the sufferings of the patients, by depriving them of efficient means of relief. The assurance which had so repeatedly been given, that the medical staff of the Hospital was efficient, naturally led us to the conclusion that, "a fortiori," it would be efficient for the less onerous duties of the Dispensary, and we felt that, by offering to continue our duties for a fortnight after our determination was communicated, the possibility of causing injury to the recipients of the charity would be avoided. We are happy to find that our opinion on the latter point was correct."

"In conclusion I would merely observe, that this attempt to throw odium upon the members of the profession to which I have the honour to belong, is strictly in keeping with the line of conduct which has been pursued in reference to our body since our first communication was made to the Sub-Committee of the Hospital, in May last.

I am, Sir,  
(for Self and Colleagues),

Your obedient servant,

125, High-street, Portsmouth.

JULIAN SLIGHT.

---

The reason the editor was prompted to insert the remarks referred to in this letter, and which were furnished most probably by the chairman of the Hospital Committee, viz., that they were prepared with an efficient staff, was not true. When they inserted their adver-



tisement in the public papers a short time after, there was but one application, and this was from Dr. Scott. Ultimately this gentleman obtained the services of another as his partner, and he was appointed to the Hospital. Then a *superannuated* naval surgeon, about 60 years of age, was asked by one of our clerical opponents, as a particular favor to permit his name to appear as one of the medical officers, and lastly a renegade from the medical ranks, another *superannuated* naval surgeon, about 70 years of age, came forward. So that the efficient medical staff consisted originally of one individual—this staff was then increased by the addition of three others, the two last so efficient, that they were considered too old for Her Majesty's Service! One of these gentlemen, Dr. Mortimer, notwithstanding the fact that his name is placed first on the list of the medical staff, declares to all his brethren that he has nothing to do with the Hospital, that his name has been used *without his sanction*, and that he has only promised to see the Dispensary patients on the Gosport side of the water. I wrote to this gentleman for an explanation, but he considers it expedient to request me not to publish his letters. The reason for this course I must leave him to explain. The following are the two *last* notes I wrote to him, and will sufficiently explain his position:—

MY DEAR SIR,

December 5th, 1848.

I very much regret that your answer to the "solicitations of many subscribers" was not different. The whole of the Medical Men on both sides of the water, with two or three exceptions, have considered it a duty to support a certain principle, which they contend will be highly conducive to the dignity and well-being of the Profession. The



Committee of Management of the Hospital are opposed to the wishes of the Medical Men. You must see the great importance of the stand your brethren have made, and I am quite sure from the tenor of your note, that you do not wish to act contrary to the express desire of the Profession. From the way your name has been placed on the medical staff, every person concludes that you have accepted office, and that you do not entertain the same views as the bulk of your professional brethren. It is very important that you should remove this impression in the most explicit and public manner.

With regard to the office you have accepted, it is impossible to take any other view of the matter than this, that you have helped the Committee of Management out of a difficulty—they could not get the patients attended to on the Gosport side of the water, because they would not yield to the reasonable and just demands of the Profession. They obtained your consent in the way and manner you describe in your note, and then parade your name as first on the list of the Medical staff—which staff contains two names which were never heard of till the present moment; and another, the name of a gentleman, who, to carry out his own selfish and monopolizing views, has arrayed himself against the wishes and desires of the whole of his professional brethren. Surely, you, as the senior in the profession, cannot wish to be in such company, and under such circumstances. Surely, the junior members of the profession ought to look to you for an example in carrying out what they consider conducive to the real interests of their body.

Let the Committee of Management yield the demands of the Medical Men, and there can be no difficulty in carrying out in the most efficient way the necessary Hospital and Dispensary arrangements—on this point there has been but one opinion in the Profession.

I have heard but one expression from every medical man I have seen since Sunday—and that is, an expression of astonishment that you should contemplate *acting in any way* for the Hospital under its present arrangement.

Do pray consider this matter. Let me beg of you to contradict the assertion of the Committee, that the Hospital is to benefit from your assistance, and withdraw at once from the very questionable connection which you admit exists between yourself and this illiberal body. I presume



you can have no objection to the publication of your letter if your professional brethren consider it necessary.

I remain,

Your's, truly,

W. C. ENGLEDDUE.

December 8th, 1848.

DEAR SIR,

I am very much surprised at the course you have decided to take, and still more so at your refusal to sanction the publication of your note to me.

Many of your medical brethren have already seen your note, and with me, they all thought that you would have taken immediate steps to place yourself in a different position. As regards the publication of your note, of course as you refuse your sanction, and give no reason for so doing, we are all left to surmise; and you must permit me to say, that I fear our surmises will not be of the most favorable construction towards you.

Of course, our correspondence now ceases, and I regret after so many years of friendly association that the conclusion to which you have now come, leaves me no other alternative than to inform you that all intercourse between us must cease. You have not acted in ignorance—you knew and thoroughly understood the wishes and determinations of your medical brethren, *for you took part in their deliberations, and made a speech confirmatory of their resolutions.*

My conduct from the first moment has not been capable of misconstruction. All my exertions have been devoted toward these objects—the cultivation of friendly professional intercourse, and the scientific advancement of all my professional brethren, and I cannot permit any man to stand between me and the attainment of these objects—after having agreed to the course decided on—and at the same time consider himself my friend.

Believe me,

Dear Sir,

Yours, &c.,

Dr. Mortimer.

W. C. ENGLEDDUE.



There have been a great number of gross mis-statements circulated with regard to the question at issue between the subscribers and the medical profession. I do not think it necessary to refer to them, because the statement of facts contained in these pages will have sufficiently explained our position, and it would be a tiresome task to refute all the absurdities which have been promulgated. There is one, however, which it may be as well to contradict again. The medical men have always declared that in every other matter *but the management of their own roster* they were to be considered amenable to the laws of the Institution. It has been most unfairly stated by the members of the Hospital Committee, that the medical men wished to arrogate to themselves the power of managing the Hospital. The simplest way of answering this statement, is to say that it is untrue, and that the parties making it know it to be untrue, and in proof of this assertion, I refer to the resolution submitted to themselves—*supported* by their chairman, partly originated by their secretary, inserted in their own minutes, and therefore a public document.\*

I have now finished, and without the slightest fear as to the result I ask for this narrative a careful perusal. If the documents contained in the preceding pages are not sufficient to enable an independent thinker to come to a satisfactory conclusion, I can only say to such an individual, I am not aware that I have mis-stated a fact, I am not conscious that I have suppressed a do-

---

\* See page 26.



cument, and I can therefore say with full confidence, if you are not satisfied, seek for further evidence, if such is in existence, in fact—*audi alteram partem*. Some would consider it right to offer an apology for the frequent reference to my own actions, and for the warmth of the language occasionally used. I cannot do so. In the first place, I cannot present the hackneyed apology of asserting that my position was thrust upon me, for it was quite the contrary. My actions were all the result of real and deliberate thought, and these thoughts were familiar to all those with whom I have discussed the subject for the last *ten* years. It was no sudden movement on my part. It was absolutely necessary therefore for me to give a detailed account, and to state the circumstances as they occurred, although the proceeding may seem somewhat egotistical. And in the second place, with regard to the tone observed, why—"If you would serve your brother, because it is fit for you to serve him, do not take back your words, when you find that *prudent* people do not commend you. Be true to your own act, and congratulate yourself if you are charged with having done something strange and extravagant, *and thus broken through the monotony of a decorous age.*" For the course which I have pursued, I am quite ready therefore to take the responsibility. If, by any chance, I should be placed in a similar position, I can see no other course open, at all consistent with the dictates of honor and integrity, or with the manifestation of those sentiments which should guide and control our every day-life movements. As to the result, let it stand



forth. As to the machinery put in motion to obtain the victory which has been gained, let it be viewed in its nakedness, and appreciated by those who love candour, fair play, and honest intentions. As to any contrast which may be instituted with regard to the two courses of conduct pursued on the purely medical part of the question, whatever may be my private opinion, I shall say nothing. For my own part, at any time, "I would rather stand on the ridge of Etna, than lower my head in the Grotto del Cane. By the one, I may share the fate of a philosopher, by the other, I must suffer the death of a cur."



the first of these is the fact that the  
the second is the fact that the  
the third is the fact that the  
the fourth is the fact that the  
the fifth is the fact that the  
the sixth is the fact that the  
the seventh is the fact that the  
the eighth is the fact that the  
the ninth is the fact that the  
the tenth is the fact that the

the eleventh is the fact that the  
the twelfth is the fact that the  
the thirteenth is the fact that the  
the fourteenth is the fact that the  
the fifteenth is the fact that the  
the sixteenth is the fact that the  
the seventeenth is the fact that the  
the eighteenth is the fact that the  
the nineteenth is the fact that the  
the twentieth is the fact that the

the twenty-first is the fact that the  
the twenty-second is the fact that the  
the twenty-third is the fact that the  
the twenty-fourth is the fact that the  
the twenty-fifth is the fact that the  
the twenty-sixth is the fact that the  
the twenty-seventh is the fact that the  
the twenty-eighth is the fact that the  
the twenty-ninth is the fact that the  
the thirtieth is the fact that the



## RÉSUMÉ.

---

Feb., 1846.—Preliminary meeting at the Dispensary. Mr. Grant proclaims the doctrine of "Free trade" in the medical appointments. Dr. Engledue and others do the same.

March 18, 1846.—Public meeting at Beneficial Society's Hall. A resolution drawn up by Messrs. Grant and Engledue, and passed unanimously, in accordance with the previous declaration, "*invites all resident medical practitioners to render their professional services.*"

April, 1846.—At a Committee meeting, an evident intention manifested to avoid carrying out the resolution. Dr. Engledue's suspicions excited. Mr. Grant still true to his original convictions.

July, 1848.—Resolution of medical men presented. The Committee issue a circular which does not recognize the principle contended for by the medical men. Epoch of Mr. Grant's tergiversation—forgets his promise of "Free trade," as well as the intention of the public document which he drew up.

August, 1848.—The Committee, Mr. Grant in the Chair, issued an explanatory (read an obscure and contradictory) letter. Medical men do not understand it, and appoint a deputation.

August 22, 1848.—Deputation received. Mr. Grant declares that the wishes of the medical men shall not be granted, and thus contradicts the explanatory letter. Threatens to resign the Chair, if the views contained in his own letter are acted upon. Resolution passed which proves the false intentions of the Committee, and the jesuitical nature of the letter.

August 28, 1848.—Messrs. Binsteed and Deacon try to arrange the matter. Mr. Grant changes his views again, by returning to his first convictions, viz., those 'of free trade,' BUT FORGETS TO RESIGN THE CHAIR. Resolution proposed and lost, and Mr. Deacon, in disgust with the acts of the Committee, resigns the office of Secretary.



Oct. 11, 1848.—Meeting of subscribers. Mr. Grant changes his views again! Free trade convictions again lose their charm, and he VOTES with the majority for vesting the appointments in the Committee of Management. The legal and clerical gentlemen vote against the proposal of the medical men. One of the former, who, as mayor, signed *the original invitation*, now votes against it. The clerical gentlemen not only vote against it, BUT IN ADDITION, PROPOSE AND CARRY A SCHEME FOR THEIR OWN PAYMENT!

Dec., 1848.—The Committee advertise for medical officers. Receive but one application, from Dr. Scott, who formerly resigned his office in the Dispensary from want of time to attend to the sick poor! The Committee elect two gentlemen, who had not previously resided in the town, a plan, which when suggested by the medical profession, *they declared they would not adopt.*

The medical staff is now in action, and *it is so efficient*, that the House Surgeon, who ought to be always at his post, in case of accidents or sudden illness, is obliged to visit the out-patients, and thus leave the Hospital without a medical attendant. Thus we have seen all this miserable shuffling—this want of good faith—this display of selfishness—this mal-arrangement, and of necessity inefficient medical superintendence—this abuse of all which can render men estimable and trustworthy, arose from a determination not to grant the just and reasonable demands of the medical profession, viz., the power to arrange their own roster while performing a gratuitous piece of work, and to permit the occasional infusion of fresh strength into their ranks.







